



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,548	03/07/2006	Maria Jose Fernandez	4258-116	9386
23448	7590	01/06/2009	EXAMINER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY / TECHNOLOGY LAW			WESTERBERG, NISSA M	
PO BOX 14329				
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/561,548	FERNANDEZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nissa M. Westerberg	1618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 - 28 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 - 15, 21, 23 - 28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 16 - 20, 22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12/1/06, 12/20/05, 10/23/08 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments, filed October 23, 2008, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be fully persuasive. The following rejections and/or objections constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 16 – 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prokop (US 2003/0170313) in view of Calias et al. (US 2003/0087877). This rejection is MAINTAINED for the reasons of record set forth in the Office Action mailed June 23, 2008 and those set forth below.

Applicant traverses this rejection on the grounds that Prokop in view of Calias et al. fail to provide any derivative basis for the claimed invention and there would have been no logical reason for one of skill in the art to combine such references. The use of a hyaluronic acid salt in the method to produce the nanoparticles of claim 16, advantageously provides nanoparticles with higher stability, as shown in the examples provided. The nanoparticles of Prokop are typically stable for 3 – 5 days, and only show a longer stability of 3 weeks at a temperature of 4°C and when they are subjected to a crosslinking step, and these are obtained and isolated by means of a different and more complex process. Prokop does not attribute the stability of the nanoparticles to the anionic polymer element. A person skilled in the art faced with the problem of developing higher stability nanoparticles would not have considered the combination of Prokop with Calias et al. as Calias et al. is directed towards the preparation of a very

different drug release system in which hyaluronic acid is selected as the biomaterial because of its free carboxyl groups. Hyaluronic acid confers stability to the therapeutic agent in Calias et al. by means of covalent interactions, whereas the nanoparticles of the invention are obtained by electrostatic interactions. Therefore, one of skill in the art would not have found it obvious that hyaluronic acid could confer a higher stability to a drug release system in the form of nanoparticles.

These arguments are not found to be persuasive. The claims use the open language of “comprising” so the presence of an additional ingredient such as a crosslinker is not excluded by the instant claims. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the stability of the formed nanoparticles over time and/or different temperature conditions) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

As a product-by-process claim, the patentability of claim 16 is evaluated based on the product and not the steps by which the product is obtained. While the product of the cited prior art may be made by a process which is different and contains more steps, Applicant must demonstrate the product produced by the claimed process and product produced by the process of the cited prior art is different and non-obvious, a showing which is not met by merely stating that the products are made by a different process. The rationale of combining the prior art or the exact problem being solved in the cited prior does not need to be the same as the reasoning applied by Applicant. Prokop discloses that a variety of anionic biopolymers can be used for the production of

Art Unit: 1618

nanoparticles while Calias et al. discloses that hyaluronic acid and any of its hyaluronate salts are functional equivalent polyanionic polysaccharide biopolymers.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nissa M. Westerberg whose telephone number is (571)270-3532. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 8:00 a.m. - 4 p.m. ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Hartley can be reached on (571) 272-0616. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1618

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael G. Hartley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618

NMW